

members of the Monterey County Medical Society that a proposition has been made that all children in Monterey County, between the ages of 5 and 12 years, be given toxin antitoxin to protect them from diphtheria,

"Resolved, That the plan of giving toxin antitoxin to all children in Monterey County is unscientific and unnecessary, because proper tests have shown that about 40 per cent of the children are immune and will not contract the disease, diphtheria, from exposure.

"Resolved, That since the California Medical Association has unanimously voted that every doctor's office is a health center for anyone who may want treatment for anything, and that the Monterey County Medical Society has endorsed this plan unanimously, be it further

"Resolved, There is no reason why those who are able to pay for this work should be taken to a public health office or public health nurse to have the work done gratuitously; and be it further

"Resolved, That any child whose parents wish this protection can receive the same from his own family physician without charge, if the expense would be a burden on the family."

Gentlemen of the Board of Supervisors of Monterey County; gentlemen of the Rockefeller Foundation who pay part of the salary of a full-time, unlicensed public health officer, may we suggest that the unfolding plan, of pauperizing our citizens by "free clinics" for everyone and wholesale inoculation of children along unscientific lines, is resented as unwarranted, unnecessary, and dangerous to the progress of public health, which we all want to see go forward?

A councilor in approving this editorial adds the following note: "I do not approve of full-time health officers. I was health officer of — for eight years; was 'fired' because I would not go on full time. An examination was held and I was one of the examiners. An enthusiast who passed with a high mark, but had been a failure in general practice, was appointed. During the next year he had several rows with the city governing authorities, got the health department in a bad muddle, and was finally gotten rid of, although his position was under Civil Service. Men who will take these 'poorly paid, uncertain political jobs' are not likely to be of a temperament to appreciate the aims of progressive organized medicine. I believe a successful practitioner makes as good an executive, is more independent of salary, and will work better in sympathy with his fellow-physicians."

CALLING THE ROLL ON ETHICS

(Read, approved, and ordered published by the Executive Committee of the C. M. A.)

The question of the invasion of hospital staffs and the practice of medicine in hospitals by cultists has become very acute in California as a result of the initiative law permitting certain classes of people to license themselves to practice medicine. All physicians know, of course, that the League for the Conservation of Public Health has been very active for several years in its hospital work, anticipating this very problem.

Certainly the ethics of the medical profession have not been changed as a result of the California elections which give groups of inadequately educated people authority to license themselves to practice medicine. Medical ethics do not permit of any recognition of cultists—licensed or unlicensed—either by individual physicians or by any contact with them in hospitals or elsewhere. There are some few physicians who have been and are violat-

ing their ethics in their personal practices and who have been conniving with cultists in such hospitals as were suitable for that purpose.

The time has arrived when the California Medical Association must go on record emphatically and positively for the good of scientific medicine. In answer to a specific request from the Stanislaus County Medical Society for a ruling, the Council unanimously passed at its 136th meeting the following:

"Resolved, That the ethics of the medical profession is a moral code, devised for the conduct of physicians in their relations with each other, with hospitals, other medical agencies, and with the public. It is the unanimous ruling of the Council of the California Medical Association that physicians shall live up fully to the spirit and letter of our ethics now as in the past. In particular, it is unethical for an educated physician—holding a degree of doctor of medicine from an acceptable institution of learning, and licensed to practice medicine and surgery or any of the specialties in California—to recognize in any way so-called 'doctors' of educational standards less than, or materially different from, those required for membership in a county medical society. So far as the medical profession is concerned, this same interpretation of ethics as applied to physicians is applied to hospitals. It is unethical, except under conditions of emergency, for a member of the California Medical Association to permit his name on the staff of a hospital that does not apply this interpretation of ethics to the institution. And it is furthermore unethical for members and ethical physicians to patronize hospitals that permit persons ineligible for membership in the California Medical Association to practice in the hospital or any of its departments."

What answer do you give yourself about this when your conscience calls the roll? How do you rate your colleagues and how do you suppose they are rating you in the retrospective hours at the close of the day?

THE TREATMENT OF MENTAL DISEASES AND DEFICIENCIES

(Read, approved, and ordered published by the Executive Committee of the C. M. A.)

Articles both by physicians and non-medical writers, calculated to arouse public interest in the treatment of mental diseases, are appearing in a number of publications. Some of these articles are decidedly of value, others are worse than useless because they show a lack of knowledge or the vision necessary to cope with so important a subject. We all need more enlightenment upon this subject, and it is to be hoped that the publication of informative, analytical, and constructive articles will continue until the public is aroused to a point that will force better care for these patients than they are now receiving.

Physicians have been insisting for years that psychiatry was as much a medical subject as appendicitis; that many mental deficiencies and diseases had their basis in, or were markedly influenced by, associated physical diseases; that a considerable number of mentally diseased patients could and ought to be cured, and that every chance of recovery should be given to all of them. Physicians have been pointing out that the vast majority of mentally ill patients were not given any such opportunity. Many of the hospitals for this class of patients are little more

than polite prisons where the inmates are given "custodial" care, and routine medical and nursing attention. Adequate facilities and competent personnel to render the service every mentally sick or defective person should have in diagnosis and treatment are found in but a very few places.

If the public can be informed of the actual situation and a practicable program placed before them, it is certain to lead to better care of these patients in better hospitals, better equipped for good work and personned by better trained psychiatrists and other physicians. Numerous articles are emphasizing physical diseases as frequent causes, in part or entirely, of many mental diseases. However, not all psychiatrists by any means follow Cotton and his colleagues entirely in their enthusiasm in believing that the correction of physical disabilities is followed so frequently by the disappearance of mental disease in the same patient.

There are numerous institutions in different states, says one medical reviewer, which have been thoroughly revolutionized as regards ordinary treatment of insane patients. There are also many others in which there is no serious lack of up-to-date intelligence at the directing center, but in which improvements have lagged because of bad politics and of an uninstructed public opinion. A great number of these institutions scattered over the country have been inferior in their personnel as a whole. It has been found much more difficult to provide good assistant physicians, good nurses, and good attendants of lower grade in hospitals for the insane than in large general hospitals for the treatment of ordinary diseases. It requires not only strong professional leadership, but also improved political conditions and an enlightened public opinion to secure from our state legislatures the appropriations necessary to provide the right kind of hospitals and equipment, and to employ superior professional talent together with trustworthy employes of non-professional grades. This general observation applies to prisons, reformatories, and other public institutions almost as truly as to hospitals for the mentally ill.

It is the business of the state to do as well as possible the things that it undertakes to do at all, in our prisons and hospitals. It was the old-fashioned view that insanity inflicted a terrible disgrace upon the individual and the family, and implied a taint that was transmitted and that could hardly be eradicated. The tendency was to conceal cases of insanity rather than to bring them forward instantly for thorough diagnosis and for hopeful treatment. Hope is a valuable factor in all the affairs of life, and it is exceptionally important in relation to an affair so sad as mental disorder.

There are few non-medically educated persons whose training is thorough enough to make their views upon these strictly professional controversies of any philosophical or scientific value. But any intelligent citizen may grasp certain practical considerations, while the philosophers and scientists disagree. *It is for the service-loving citizen to demand that in the care of the wards of the state in its hospitals and other institutions there should be medical efficiency and up-to-date management.*

TALKERS AND WORKERS

Under this heading the Saturday Evening Post of May 31, 1924, publishes an editorial which has had such a remarkable appeal to a number of our members who are "carrying the ball" in our own medical organization that they have prevailed upon your editor to reproduce it:

"All organizations must have bosses—that is, people who are on the job 365 days a year. If an organization is large enough, and in addition powerful and prosperous, the bosses are known to the lazy arm-chair critics as inside or vested interests. If it is a small concern, like the men's brotherhood of the First Methodist Church or the local social club, the indispensable chairman of the entertainment or house committee is not termed a vested interest but is merely criticized without bouquets of any kind."

Someone must control the Republican party, the Smithtown Gulf Club, Harvard University, the Men's Social Club of Kokopee, and the United States Steel Corporation. The old clique which is now in control is charged, and no doubt justly, with passing the jobs around to the boys on the inside. Once in a while an indignant electorate or membership or group of investors throws out the inside bunch and a new deal is started. All organizations will die of dry rot if no new blood comes in, and there are times when only a surgical operation makes such assistance possible.

But analyze any organization and see what you find. Usually the insiders are there because they are interested, reasonably experienced and willing to give of their time. Nearly all the critics on the outside either lack experience and knowledge or will not give up other occupations. Most of the critics will not even attend the annual meetings if there happens to be a good movie on that night. Indeed, they will not even fill out a return postal card to the extent of running a pencil through the line that reads "I will attend the meeting." But the next time they enter the club, how they do pan the house committee for the way the pictures are hung!

It is fashionable in certain quarters to say that the great universities are run by vested and capitalistic interests, and to imply thereby that these institutions of learning cannot amount to much. A study of one such university shows that to all intents and purposes it is run by four men.

The reasons these four men exert so much influence are simple in the extreme. In the first place, they live rather close and are thus in a better position than many others to attend meetings. In the second place, they are so interested in the work that they are willing to sacrifice business, professional and personal interests to attend all committee meetings. Such willingness is not a matter of wealth, but of personal inclination. Two of the four happen to be wealthy; the other two are not. In the third and last place, before these men came to dominate the situation they had had experience and training on minor committees, and showed their interests in these details. Such a rule has exceptions, but, generally speaking, the inside interests are inside because they are willing to take the trouble and do the hard work, while the people on the outside are willing only to knock."—Reprinted by permission of the Saturday Evening Post. Copyright 1924 by the Curtis Publishing Company.

Bully! And it fits almost all sorts of organizations AND includes all sorts of "workers" AND most classes of "talkers."

There are two classes of "talkers" who are not specifically mentioned in the editorial to whom we would nevertheless commend its import: One group is made up of those who dash off their libelous opinions in letters and sign them. This is dangerous business. It must be an awful blow to the